

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	09/03/2015
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	19/2/15
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Darlene Dike			2015/0112/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
76 Leverton Street London NW5 2NY			Site Location Plan; Site Plan; 26LS-009; 26LS-010; 26LS-011; 26LS-012; 26LS-013; 26LS-014; 26LS-015; 76LS-001; 76LS-002; 76LS-003; 76LS-004; 76LS-005; 76LS-006; 76LS-007; Crittall Details; Design and Access Statement		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Erection of a single storey rear extension with green roof, mansard roof extension with 2 front rooflights, 3 rear rooflights and 6 photovoltaic panels, and alterations to fenestration to include creation of rear Juliet balcony.					
Recommendation(s):					
Application Type:		Householder Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	06	No. of responses	2	No. of objections	1
			No. Electronic	2		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from 28/01/2015 to 18/02/2015. A press notice was published from 29/01/2015 to 19/02/2015.</p> <p>Two responses were received, one objection from 80 Leverton Street and one comment from 1 Countess Road, which are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Height of the mansard roof extension is unduly high, and does respect the step between houses resulting from the gradient of the street - The mansard roof extension is very close to the front parapet and may consequently be visible from the street <p>Officer's Response See paragraphs 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>	<p>Kentish Town CAAC made the following objection:</p> <p>The mansard roof appears from the plans to be too high and would almost be the same height as that of 78 the neighbouring house thus not taking into account the gradient of the street. The front mansard runs too close to the parapet and risks being seen from the road. Mansards change the roof form and are uncharacteristic to the area and have an adverse effect on the CA skyline.</p> <p>Officer's Response See paragraphs 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5</p>					

Site Description

The application site comprises a three-storey terraced house located on the eastern side of Leverton Street, close to the junction with Countess Road. The property lies within a uniform terrace, stepped in height as a result of the gradient of the street.

The site is located in the Kentish Town conservation area and, while not listed, the building is noted as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Relevant History

APPLICATION SITE

No relevant history.

NEIGHBOURING SITES

78 Leverton Street

2008/1500/P - Erection of a single storey rear extension following the demolition of the existing single storey rear extension. **Granted 14/05/2008.**

82 Leverton Street

2004/3342/P - Erection of a ground floor rear extension, first floor rear extension and roof extension. **Granted 5/10/2004.**

84 Leverton Street

2012/1170/P - Erection of a mansard roof extension with rooflights to front and rear and 1x solar panel; erection of single storey glazed conservatory and storeroom to rear; and reinstatement of stucco parapet mouldings to front of dwelling (Class C3). **Granted 18/04/2012.**

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

London Plan 2011

Camden LDF Core Strategy 2010

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

Camden Development Policies 2010

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

Camden Planning Guidance 2013

CPG1 Design – Chapters 4 and 5

CPG3 Sustainability – Chapters 4 and 10

CPG6 Amenity – Chapters 6 and 7

Kentish Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2011

Pages 21, 25, 28, 37 and 41

Assessment

1. Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the following works:

- Installation of a mansard roof extension with two front and three rear rooflights, and 6 photovoltaic panels
- Erection of a single storey rear extension with green roof, following demolition of two existing extensions
- Replacement of rear, first floor sash window with French doors and installation of Juliet balcony
- Infilling of existing third floor rear window

2. Revisions

2.1 In response to comments from Council planning officers the following amendments were made to the scheme:

- The floor to ceiling height of the proposed mansard roof extension was reduced from 2700mm to 2300mm, to fall in line with CPG1 guidance
- Proposals to build up the rear parapet were revised in favour of a design which preserves the valley profile to the parapet line
- The application originally included the installation of two front and two rear dormers which were replaced, to the front and rear, with conservation style rooflights

3. Assessment

3.1 The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:

- Design (Visual impact)
- Amenity (Impact on the amenity of adjoining neighbours)

4. Design

4.1 Roof Extension

4.2 Mansard roof extensions are a common feature of the uniform terrace that 76 Leverton Street sits within, and are present at properties at numbers 78, 80, 82, 86 and 88. Number 84 also, has recent consent for a mansard roof extension which is yet to be implemented (see relevant history above). This forms an established pattern of additions and alterations at roof level, and given this precedent, the principle of a mansard roof extension at 76 Leverton Street is considered acceptable.

4.3 CPG1 informs the basic principles of good design for mansard roof extensions, and proposals comply entirely with its guidelines. In keeping with CPG1, the lower slopes of the proposed mansard rise at an angle of 70 degrees and are set well back behind the parapet wall at the front in particular - sufficiently to minimise visibility from street level. In addition the roofing material would be of the highest quality, comprising solely natural slates.

4.4 The most prevalent concerns within the objections raised relate to the height of the mansard. Initially the scheme proposed an internal floor to ceiling height of 2700mm which on planning officer's advice was revised down to 2300mm. This fully addresses any reservations over height as the current proposed floor to ceiling height of 2300mm is well in keeping with guidance set out in CPG1, and would allow the mansard to form a subordinate addition to the host building, causing minimal visual disruption to the existing stepped gradient of the rooflines within the terrace.

4.5 Revisions also replaced proposed dormer windows to the front and rear with flush conservation style rooflights. These would form a far less prominent addition to the roofslope than dormers, and particularly at the front of the property, would prevent any additional bulk to the mansard which could be visible from the street. Positioned in line with existing windows the proposed rooflights would also serve to complement the symmetry of the host building. The addition of solar panels to the upper roofslope poses no harm in terms of design either, and in line with CPG3 make a welcome contribution to the sustainability of the proposed scheme.

4.6 The rear elevation benefits too from revisions to the scheme which retain the butterfly profile to the parapet line. This considered design choice respects 'the general and important characteristic of unaltered roof parapet lines' that 'still persists on Leverton Street', highlighted within the Kentish Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement (page 37). It also means that proposals fully comply with CPG1 guidance which states that 'on buildings with a 'valley' or 'butterfly' roof if a mansard extension is considered acceptable...then the parapet should be retained.'

4.7 Rear Extension

- 4.8 A single storey rear extension is proposed which would measure 5.8m (width) by 4.2m (depth) by 2.7m (height), and so allow for the retention of a reasonably sized garden. Similarly to the two awkward part-width extensions it replaces, and the full width rear extensions at numbers 74, 76, 78, 80, 82, 86, 88 and 90 Leverton Street which set a clear precedent for additions of its kind, the proposed extension would be wholly secondary to the host building in terms of its scale and massing.
- 4.9 Given its position at the rear of the property and the fact that it would be concealed behind existing boundary walls, the proposed extension would not be visible from the public realm and so will have no negative impact on the street scene.
- 4.10 Constructed from London stock brick to match the original building fabric, and featuring aesthetic crittall windows to the full width of the rear elevation, the materials and detailed design of the extension are considered acceptable and would contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The addition of a green roof only enhances the extension's positive visual contribution to its setting, and meets the aspirations of CPG3 that 'schemes must incorporate green roofs...wherever suitable.'

4.11 Alterations to Fenestration

- 4.12 The proposed changes to replace a rear sash window with French doors, install a Juliet balcony and infill an existing third floor window are considered sympathetic to the host building and the wider terrace. It is considered that the changes respect the overall pattern of the terrace and sit well with the configuration of adjacent fenestration at 74 and 78 Leverton Street, pivotal as these elevations are visible from street level along Countess Road. The proposed French door would be timber to match the existing frames and fit within existing openings, and so is considered acceptable in design terms.

5. **Amenity**

- 5.1 The proposed roof extension is not considered to raise any amenity issues. Given the location of the works at roof level, it is considered that there would be limited opportunities for overlooking or loss of privacy and the addition of rooflights to the front and rear would not exacerbate the current level of overlooking which already occurs from the existing second floor windows. No outlook or sunlight/daylight issues are envisaged.

The proposed rear extension would not extend above the existing boundary walls and so it is not anticipated to exacerbate any existing amenity issues at the site – nor would it have any impact on privacy, outlook, sunlight or daylight to the neighbouring properties. Whilst the loss of garden space is regrettable, it is not considered that this would not cause significant harm so as to warrant refusal of the application and in any case, the existing rear extension occupies a similar proportion of garden space.

6. **Recommendation**

Grant Planning Permission.

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on *Monday 16th March 2015*. For further information please go to www.camden.gov.uk and search for 'members briefing'

